



President: Mr. Jorge E. ILLUECA (Panama).

AGENDA ITEM 34

The situation in the Middle East: reports of the Secretary-General (*continued*)

1. Mr. MACIEL (Brazil): The situation in the Middle East is today, unfortunately, more serious and complex than it was almost 40 years ago, in the early days of the Organization. Then, as now, violence and fear prevailed over sincere desires for peace and understanding. At that time, as is happening now, a certain sense of hopelessness permeated the whole question and the efforts made to solve it. It is still far from possible to say that a comprehensive, just and lasting solution of the problems of the region is any closer now than when we started dealing with them in the United Nations.

2. However, we must renew at every moment our attempts to prevent this situation redounding to the discredit of the Organization and its mechanisms. We must consolidate those mechanisms as the real alternative to the use of force and achieve universal acceptance of the realization that lasting peace is possible only if all States work together to make the United Nations a true forum for the settlement of disputes and the attainment of peace.

3. Brazil's position on this particular agenda item has been made very clear on numerous occasions. I recall once again some of the elements that we consider prerequisites for a just, comprehensive and lasting settlement: the complete withdrawal of all forces of occupation from the Arab territories, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), respect for the right of the Palestinian people to return to Palestine, and recognition of their right to self-determination, independence and sovereignty, participation by the Palestinian people, through the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO], their sole legitimate representative, in any negotiations regarding their future, and recognition of the right of all States in the region, including Israel, to exist within internationally recognized boundaries.

4. To those elements, we would also add the necessity to respect the provisions of Security Council resolutions concerning certain measures taken by Israel in relation to Palestinian and other Arab territories. In particular, it should be stressed that some of the actions taken by the Israeli authorities—such as continuing to establish settlements in the West Bank, their illegal annexation of Jerusalem and the Golan Heights, and the arrest and deportation of elected Arab leaders—cannot but aggravate the tense situation in the region and hamper the prospects for serious negotiations.

5. Brazil summarized its position on this question during the general debate, when the Minister of State for External Relations stated:

“It is increasingly urgent to implement the United Nations resolutions which express an international consensus in favour of a comprehensive, just and

lasting solution to the successive crises in the Middle East. My Government firmly adheres to the terms of those resolutions and vehemently condemns the policy of *faits accomplis* that has hampered negotiations in that region. We must insist upon justice prevailing, upon the evacuation of territory held by force, upon the implementation of the rights of the Palestinian people, upon the creation of conditions that will make it possible for all States in that region to live in peace within their own frontiers.” [5th meeting, para. 66.]

6. At a time like this, when alarming events take place on an almost daily basis, I cannot fail to speak of Brazil's deepening concern about the increasing violence, danger and suffering in Lebanon, a country whose independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty must be fully respected. Brazil is very closely attached to Lebanon, especially because a considerable number of Lebanese and their descendants have made an extremely valuable contribution to my country's progress.

7. In conclusion, I wish to refer to the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September this year. Brazil participated in the Conference with a very positive attitude, being fully aware of its importance. We pledge ourselves to continue to contribute as much as we can to the settlement of the question of Palestine, which we consider to be at the very core of the problems that trouble the Middle East.

8. Mr. KASRAWI (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The crux of the conflict in the Middle East consists in the fact that the Palestinian tragedy remains without a just solution, while the occupation by Israel of Arab territories persists. The instability and tension that we are now witnessing are the result of Israeli attempts to hide this fundamental truth and divert attention from it. This is the core of the Middle East crisis: Israel's persistence in evading its responsibility regarding the Palestinian issue, in denying the Palestinian people's right to its homeland, Palestine, and in clinging to Arab territories.

9. The tension and warfare prevailing in the region were born with the Palestinian conflict. Since 1948, the Middle East has known continuous tension. All wars waged in in the Arab region have been due to the absence of a just and peaceful solution to this problem.

10. Four major wars have taken place, over and above Israel's invasion of Lebanon and its occupation of the south of Lebanon, because of the perpetuation of the question of Palestine and the continuation of the occupation by Israel of Arab territories. The majority of the States of the world now recognize that the question of Palestine is at the very heart of the Middle East crisis. Accordingly, they want Palestinian rights to be recognized and those rights to be established on the basis of justice, and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the rules of international law. The more convinced the international community is of the justice of the Palestinian cause and of its importance, the more Israel persists in disregarding this and opposing it with the utmost vigour. To that end, Israel has mobilized all its military resources against the Arab States and the Palestinian people, thus creating the situation at present prevailing

in the region. Israel is thereby attempting to divert the attention of the world from its continuing occupation of the Arab territories and its expansionist policies to secondary conflicts resulting from the policies it pursues.

11. That is why any serious approach to the Middle East crisis must be based on the need to give priority to the question of Palestine and the continuing Israeli occupation of the Arab territories. If this is not done, the region will remain troubled and that trouble will spread beyond the confines of the region itself and involve the rivalry of the major Powers, which give priority to their own interests at the expense of the legitimate interests of the peoples and countries of the region. This is the objective of the policy of Israel, which is trying to free itself from responsibility with regard to the question of Palestine and the need to withdraw from Arab territories. Israel has always tried to hide that occupation and the problems arising therefrom by attempting to bring the Middle East within the framework of international rivalries, and its interests are in keeping with those of the partisans of the polarization and internationalization of the Middle East crisis.

12. The establishment of peace and stability in the region will only be possible if, at the same time, a just, comprehensive and peaceful solution is found. That is why we must stress two points. First, the search for stability and security in the Middle East cannot be fruitful and serious as long as Israel persists in its occupation of Arab territories occupied in 1967 and in its illegitimate and illegal practices in those territories. Secondly, because of Israel's policies, aimed at the gradual annexation of the occupied Arab territories, it feels that time is working in its favour and is feverishly attempting to impose *faits accomplis* by trying to modify the demographic and geographic character of the West Bank, including Arab Jerusalem, Gaza and the Golan Heights and make withdrawal from that area within the framework of a peaceful solution and the restoration of its Arab identity impossible. That is why Israel is doing everything in its power to prevent international pressure from being brought to bear against it and to ensure that its annexation of Arab territories reaches the point of no return, in accordance with its objectives.

13. The Israeli settlement policy, carried out feverishly in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, is the best practical demonstration of Israel's policy aimed at preventing the establishment of peace. By attempting gradually to devour the Arab territories, it is preventing the only possible political solution, which is land in exchange for peace. That is why Israel is pursuing a related policy against neighbouring Arab territories, resorting to force and the launching of pre-emptive surprise attacks, such as its attack against Lebanon in 1982, to divert attention from what is happening in the occupied Arab territories and exploit the serious situation being created there to focus that attention on matters that have nothing to do with the real reasons for the crisis that has plagued the Middle East since the creation of the State of Israel.

14. In order to respond effectively to Israeli practices and to thwart its hegemonist policy in the region, as well as its attempts to foil peaceful efforts to treat the root of the problem, it is necessary to emphasize the need for a peaceful and just solution. The Security Council, which has primary responsibility for enforcing the will of the United Nations in maintaining international peace and security, must ensure respect for resolution 242 (1967) on the situation in the Middle East. Despite everything, however, Israel has disregarded that resolution and done everything possible to prevent its implementation. Israel has also thwarted all efforts to restore peace in the region

and resisted all attempts to force it to withdraw from all the Arab territories occupied in June 1967 and to respect the historical, legitimate rights of the Palestinian people on their national soil, as well as the right of all countries of the region to live in peace within secure and internationally recognized boundaries. Israel has rejected the many peace initiatives, among them the Arab peace plan, embodied in the Final Declaration¹ adopted on 9 September 1982 at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez, and the peace initiative of President Reagan of 22 September 1982,² which would in no way have harmed Israel's security, as that country claimed, as a pretext for refusing to withdraw from the occupied Arab territories and to cover up its settlement policy in the area. That is why we must realize that Israel puts its own territorial ambitions above the desire of peace and spares no effort to achieve those ambitions.

15. We must also realize something else when considering Israeli policy aimed at denying the Palestinian people their legitimate rights, appropriating the Arab territories, imposing its will on the Arab nation through the abuse of military force and intimidating all those who support or are committed to Arab rights. It is that Israel wants to be the law in the region and its master, in keeping with its expansionist policy, all by means of force. Israel invokes moral or security considerations to justify its policy, arguing on the basis of security needs or claiming that the Arabs represent a threat to its existence. But who is threatening whom? Is it not those who are occupying more than a third of the soil of Lebanon, the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and the Golan Heights, thus maintaining the Arab region in a constant state of self-defence?

16. Israel has been able to carry out this policy because of the unlimited aid that it has been receiving for years from outside. That support has enabled it to develop enormous military might which it uses against the Arab States and as an instrument of its intransigent policy and to defy the will of the international community. Israel's prodigious war effort, the unconditional aid it receives from outside and its foreign policy of expansionism and extremism are responsible for the recrudescence of tension in the region. The unconditional aid lavished on Israel, particularly in the course of its occupation of Arab territories, gives Israel the impression that the providers of such aid endorse its policy in the region.

17. Not only is Israel receiving a huge amount of unconditional aid, but a new Israeli-American agreement has been announced which makes the situation even worse. A new phase has been reached in the escalation of tension in the region. Israel is in occupation of Arab territories, and disregards all peace efforts, even those made by its partner in this alliance. The conclusion of the alliance and the indulgence from which Israel had previously benefited will not only have adverse effects on Arab territories and rights but appear to be an endorsement by the United States of Israel's policy towards those territories and their legitimate owners.

18. This agreement is ultimately pernicious to the interests of the United States in the region. It is contrary to the mediating role the United States claims it is playing, and deprives what remains of the peace initiatives of all practical content. Thanks to the unlimited support it had previously received, Israel was able to ignore and reject all international initiatives towards a just, peaceful and comprehensive solution. This recently concluded agreement, regarding which Israel stated through its Prime Minister that it had obtained everything it wanted without granting a single concession, will increase its intransigence and its contempt for the rights of others.

19. The first result of the agreement is the strengthening of Israel's policy of imposing *faits accomplis* on the region, leading to a military imbalance and an attempt by Israel to impose military action instead of political solutions as a means of dealing with the problems of the region.

20. In conclusion, it is with considerable emotion that we view the situation in fraternal Lebanon, which Israel seeks to convert into a permanent battlefield through which to drain Arab strength and divert attention from its strategy aimed at Judaizing Arab Jerusalem, the West Bank and Gaza. We are perfectly well aware of the gravity of events in Lebanon and its repercussions on Arab rights in Palestine and that is why we support all efforts to bring about a solution, particularly the efforts of the Lebanese Government aimed at ensuring the independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty of Lebanon.

21. Jordan has always endorsed all efforts to find a comprehensive solution to this Arab-Israeli conflict, has loyally supported Palestinian rights and has opted for a political settlement of the Palestinian problem and the Arab-Israeli conflict. This is one of the fundamental principles of our foreign policy. Jordan has worked within the Arab and the international frameworks in support of all initiatives and efforts to bring about a political solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict. The United Nations is duty-bound to carry out its responsibilities to achieve the just peace to which we all aspire by dealing with the root causes of that conflict.

22. Mr. BIGOMBE (Uganda): For over 36 years, the Middle East has been a continuous hotbed of tension beset with constant crises and tragic events. The main source of this tension is the negative and dangerous policy pursued by Israel against the neighbouring Arab countries and the Palestinian people. Even as we deliberate here, the Palestinians continue to be targets of Israeli bombardment in northern Lebanon. The southern part of Lebanon continues to be occupied, in spite of the injunctions of the Security Council and the General Assembly calling on Israel to withdraw. Both the Lebanese and the Palestinians are subjected to harassment and torture.

23. The Israeli invasion of Lebanon last year, so bloody, so massive, did not take place suddenly. The Israeli raid on the Tammuz nuclear installation in Iraq, the previous raids and bombardment of Beirut and the annexation of the Golan Heights, all of which happened in 1981, were preparations for what was to come.

24. One objective of the Israeli invasion and the continued occupation of Lebanon has been to destroy the PLO, both militarily and politically. It was Israel's hope that the populations of the West Bank and Gaza could then be induced to accept Israel's absorption of these territories. Mr. Menachem Wilson, who was then civilian administrator of the West Bank articulated the real Israeli objectives when he stated that the PLO defeat in Lebanon would force the Palestinians in the West Bank to work within strict limitations. It was also their expectation that the world's preoccupation with the events in Lebanon and the agony of the Lebanese and Palestinians therein would divert attention from Israel's practices in the occupied territories. As pointed out in the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories [A/38/409], Israel has, since then, intensified its expropriation of Arab lands and properties and the establishment of massive settlements. Collective punishments, the persecution of students, coupled with the deportation and expulsion of the indigenous Arab population, are eroding the Arab character of the territories

and bringing about a *de facto* annexation. These policies must be resisted by the international community. They are contrary to the principles of international law and are explicitly prohibited by the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.³

25. As we have stated before, the occupation of the lands of neighbours will not give Israel the security it seeks. On the contrary, it will only increase its insecurity and vulnerability.

26. The question of Palestine has always been and remains the core of the Middle East conflict. Peace in the region is conditional upon recognition and respect for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. There can be no peace without a just and comprehensive settlement that takes full account of the right of the Palestinian people, particularly their right to self-determination and to a homeland of their own.

27. Contrary to Israel's expectations, the bombardment of the PLO in Lebanon has not reduced the force of Palestinian nationalism in any way. The PLO has emerged from Israel's onslaught with its political stature intact. It remains the sole and authentic voice of the Palestinians.

28. The events in Lebanon brought home, even to some who had doubts, that the just cause of the Palestinian people must be supported. A number of peace initiatives were advanced. The Arab leaders and the PLO demonstrated courage and statesmanship when they adopted the Fez proposals, which offer a good basis for a settlement that would take into account the interests of all parties to the conflict. Friends of Israel have put forward other proposals, such as the declaration issued at Venice on 13 June 1980 by the European Council⁴ and the Reagan initiative,² which would form a basis for negotiations.

29. But as the lands Israel once professed to hold as bargaining chips have become, in its view, non-negotiable, the Israeli response to all these initiatives has been negative and provocative. Rather than heed the call of the international community, it has replied by establishing extensive settlements. Israel seeks to assert the prerogative of military power and the *fait accompli*. It is incumbent on the international community to forestall such designs.

30. In this connection, the Geneva Declaration on Palestine⁵ and the Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights,³ adopted by the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983, should be implemented. The Geneva Declaration on Palestine calls for the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East in which all the parties concerned, including the PLO, and the United States and the Soviet Union, would participate on an equal footing. We believe that this points the way forward. The conference, which would be under the auspices of the United Nations, would work out a comprehensive and just solution to the Middle East problem. The Programme of Action for the Achievement of Palestinian Rights calls for the implementation of measures to force Israel to comply with United Nations resolutions. We call on all Member States to implement the Programme of Action. The Security Council has a special responsibility for responding to the Geneva Declaration on Palestine by making arrangements for the proposed conference.

31. The United Nations must act now if we are to forestall a major catastrophe. It must once again become a forum for negotiations among the parties and provide a framework for a just and comprehensive peace. A framework for peace can be just only if it restores the rights

of the Palestinian people, and can be comprehensive only if it takes into account all the legitimate aspirations in the region and is drawn up with the participation of all the parties concerned.

32. Since the Palestinian question lies at the root of the Middle East problem, the following are indispensable elements for peace in the Middle East: first, Israeli withdrawal from all Palestinian and other Arab territories, including the City of Jerusalem, occupied since 1967; secondly, the establishment of an independent Palestinian State in Palestine; and, thirdly, the direct and equal participation of the PLO, as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, in any peace process. To pretend that a solution can be found to the Middle East conflict without the participation of the PLO is to bury one's head in deep sand.

33. We have an urgent duty to work for peace in the Middle East. In this respect, Uganda is ready and willing to make its contribution.

34. Mr. AL-QAYSI (Iraq): In his statement before the General Assembly on 8 December, the representative of Israel stated that in addressing the item before us, namely, "The situation in the Middle East", the Assembly should "for once approach the issue in its proper perspective" [88th meeting, para. 3]. What is his "proper perspective?" He told us that we should not pretend that the Arab-Israeli conflict lies at the root of the region's many other problems or is somehow intimately connected with them as this is an ostrich-like approach; that the Arab-Israeli conflict is but one of many flash-points in the region; that many of the other flash-points pose a more immediate danger to regional and world security; and that the Arab-Israeli conflict is not at the core of these other menacing problems but is itself just one symptom of a broader malaise. What is that malaise? In the Zionist spokesman's view, it is the "long-standing inter-Arab rivalry and disunity" [ibid., para. 2]. To complete the picture of the Zionist perspective, the representative of Israel stated that the Middle East has been plagued by instability and conflict since the dawn of history. Rather than look that far back, he urged us to examine briefly the last 30 years.

35. Then he proceeded with his so-called examination. In this process, he produced nothing but an outright attack on all the Arab States of the Middle East, their leaders, policies and peoples, as well as the United Nations. He concluded as follows:

"The distorted presentation of the Arab-Israeli conflict as the root of all Middle East problems and as the sole danger in our region to world peace must inevitably lead to the conclusion that the Organization has no intention of dealing with the real world, but prefers to preoccupy itself with barren rhetoric and pseudo-issues. Regrettably, if past performance is any guide, this is what must be anticipated by any realistic observer of the United Nations scene." [Ibid., para. 41.]

36. I have elected to set out the structure of the statement of the representative of Israel first because it is the only way to uncover Israel's diversionary tactics, cheap propagandist objectives, sophistry and mendacity.

37. We have become well accustomed to the diversionary tactics of the Zionists which all too often aim at distorting the parameters of items on our agenda. The item entitled "The situation in the Middle East" used to mean the situation arising out of the Zionist-Palestinian conflict, which came to encompass the occupation by Israel of Palestinian and other Arab territories belonging to or administered by three neighbouring Arab States, namely, Egypt, Jordan and the Syrian Arab Republic. Now, thanks to Israel's spiralling escalation of its acts of aggression,

the item also includes Israeli aggression against Iraq and the massive invasion and occupation of Lebanon, with all their horrendous and far-reaching consequences.

38. No less apparent than the diversionary tactics are the sophistry and the mendacity in which the representative of Israel has engaged. He advocates the view that the Arab-Israeli conflict is just one symptom of the so-called broader malaise of the long-standing inter-Arab rivalry and disunity. This is, indeed, a hypocritical rewriting of history as it contradicts the long historical process of the Zionists' scheming and manipulation to colonize Palestine and the Arab territories. The Zionists' words and deeds admit this historical fact, and it is surprising to see the ardent Zionist from Israel playing ignorant. But, supposing he is so, and since he makes a plea for the real world, let us provide him with a bird's-eye view of the Zionists' admissions in this respect.

39. I am sure the Israeli representative would agree with me that Ben-Gurion was more visionary and more prophetic in viewing the problems and future of Israel than he is. What did the late Ben-Gurion have to say on this question? The Zionist magazine *Moment*, published in the United States, contained in its issue of September 1977, volume 2, No. 9, a long interview with Nahum Goldmann, one of the veteran leaders of the Zionist movement and a founder of at least half a dozen Zionist organizations throughout the world. In that interview, Goldmann was reminiscing and began to talk about a meeting he had had with Ben-Gurion in private some years earlier, shortly before Ben-Gurion's death. The climate of the meeting, as described by Goldmann, was one of privacy, enabling both of them to be candid and to have a heart-to-heart talk. Goldmann said that Ben-Gurion had told him:

"If you ask me why I want arms and strength, it is simple. Why should the Arabs make peace with us? Are they crazy? If I were an Arab, would I accept Israel? We came and we stole their country. Why should they make peace?"

Goldmann says: "I was shuddering and I said: 'How do you see the situation?' So he said, 'I will tell you. I shall be 70 in two or three months. If you ask me if I shall die and be buried in a Jewish State, since I shall live 10 more years, maybe 15, I think, yes, I shall die and be buried in a Jewish State. My son, Amos, will be 50 in October. If you ask me if he will die and be buried in a Jewish State, he has at best a 50 per cent chance.' I shall never forget it," comments Goldmann. "So I said, 'B-G, how do you sleep at night, being the Prime Minister, with that prospect?' So he replied, 'Who told you I sleep at night?'"

40. Now is Nahum Goldmann an anti-Semite? Is it not the height of cynicism for the representative of Zionism to come here and allege that the Arab-Israeli conflict is not the hard core of the situation in the Middle East, when one of the founding fathers of his entity was so heavily burdened—so it seems—with the conscious guilt of the crime of stealing a country that belonged to the Arabs? Of course it is, and it is not surprising either that the Zionist spokesman used that sophistry as he was hoping to dilute the issue and cloud our vision.

41. No less significant is the mendacity of the Zionist spokesman's call for a so-called much-needed realistic and honest approach. Let us take him up on this score. In his statement there is only one sentence which may be considered as falling within the item before us. It is the following: "Israel would be the last to deny the importance of resolving the Arab-Israeli conflict in a constructive and equitable manner" [ibid., para. 2].

42. Let us weigh this alleged readiness. To begin with, I should like to point out that the sentence I have just

quoted came at the beginning of the Zionist statement, and no sooner was it made than it was immediately followed by sentences aimed at taking the hard core of the item out of its context. What is the constructive and equitable manner for the resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict in present-day Zionist thinking? This is the question. During the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly we referred in full to this aspect of the problem, and in view of the alleged readiness of the Zionists this year for constructive and equitable peace, the reference to their thinking merits repeating.

43. An article by Oded Yinon entitled "A Strategy for Israel in the 1980s" published in *Kivunim*—a journal for Judaism and Zionism—issue No. 14, February 1982, published by the Department of Publicity of the World Zionist Organization, Jerusalem, is highly pertinent and reveals in detail Israel's role as an imperialist Power during this decade.

44. The writer asserts that today Israel suddenly faces immense opportunities for thoroughly transforming the whole situation in the region and this Israel must do in the present decade, otherwise it will not survive as a State. The plan entails nothing less than the fragmentation of the whole Arab world into small entities divided along sectarian and ethnic lines. He further asserts that "regaining the Sinai peninsula with its present and potential resources is a first-rate political aim which is obstructed by the Camp David accords and the peace agreements" and that "breaking Egypt down territorially into distinct geographical regions is the political aim of Israel in the 1980s on its western front."

45. He sees the situation in Lebanon as a precedent for the entire Arab world, including Egypt, the Syrian Arab Republic, Iraq and the Arabian peninsula. The author states:

"the dissolution of Syria and Iraq later on into ethnical or religiously unique areas, such as in Lebanon, is Israel's primary target on the eastern front in the long run, while the dissolution of the military power of those States serves as the primary short-term target."

46. As to Jordan, and the occupied West Bank, he states the following:

"Changing the régime east of the river will also cause the termination of the problem of the territories densely populated with Arabs west of the Jordan; whether in war or under conditions of peace, emigration from the territories and an economic freeze in them are the guarantees for the coming change on both banks of the river, and we ought to be active in order to accelerate this process in the nearest future."

The writer asserts again:

"it is not possible to go on living in this country in the present situation without separating the two nations, the Arabs to Jordan and the Jews to the areas west of the river. Genuine coexistence and peace will reign over the land only when the Arabs understand that without Jewish rule between the Jordan and the sea they will have neither existence nor security. A nation of their own and security will be theirs only in Jordan . . . The solution of the problem of the indigenous Arabs will come only when they recognize the existence of Israel in secure borders to the Jordan River and beyond it, as an existential need in this difficult epoch, the nuclear epoch, which we shall soon enter. It is no longer possible to live with three fourths of the Jewish population on this dense shoreline which is so dangerous in a nuclear epoch. Dispersal of the population is therefore a domestic strategic aim of the highest order, otherwise we shall cease to exist within any borders."

47. As to world Jewry, the writer says:

"rapid changes in the world will also bring about a change in the condition of world Jewry, to which Israel will become not only a last resort but the only existential option. We cannot assume that United States Jews and the communities of Europe and Latin America will continue to exist in the present form in the future."

48. I have quoted this extract at length as the writer, Oded Yinon, is neither an anti-Semite nor a spokesman for a lunatic fringe. He is a noted journalist and a former employee of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the journal which published his article is regarded as a publication which reflects the ideology of the World Zionist Organization—a body which plays a very active role itself in the planning, financing and implementation of the settlement of Jewish immigrants in the colonies being constructed in the occupied Arab territories.

49. It is also important to note that Sharon went even further than Oded Yinon, for he did not limit Israel's strategic and security interests to the Arab world alone, but included Pakistan, Turkey, and the Islamic Republic of Iran, and stretched deep into Central Africa.

50. Is it clear why the Zionist spokesman attempted to distort the item by shifting the focal point, both in terms of substance and geography? Indeed, the reason should be clear by now to the General Assembly. It is the Zionist strategic thinking and plans, initiated since the adoption by the World Zionist Organization of the Biltmore Programme in 1942.

51. We should not be astonished to realize that much of the extract I quoted on Zionist strategic thinking and plans is corroborated by reality, whether on the spot or here in the General Assembly by the demonstration of the Zionist spokesman.

52. The concept of *Eretz Yisrael*, which the Zionists coined for a decisive end, is now reflected by the complete Zionist colonial grip over the whole of Palestine and the relentless affirmations that Arab Palestine lies east of the Jordan.

53. We should not be astonished that the Zionist spokesman laments the situation in Lebanon, because Israel's interest in that country has a long history and its carnage there is the fulfilment of a long-held dream. In 1948, Ben-Gurion who, as Prime Minister of Israel, could not sleep at night, wrote in his diary: "A Christian state ought to be set up there, with its southern frontiers on the Litani".

54. Note the emphasis on religion, please. Moreover, the diaries of Moshe Sharett, Israel's Minister for Foreign Affairs and later on Prime Minister between 1949 and 1956, reveal that Ben-Gurion, like his Chief of Staff, Moshe Dayan, was obsessed by the idea of intervening in Lebanon. Dayan continued to be so, and after the war of 1967 he remarked ominously that all of Israel's borders, except for the one with Lebanon, were now ideal. According to Sharett, in May 1955 Dayan recommended an immediate intervention in Lebanon so that "the territory from the Litani southward will be totally annexed to Israel".

55. In this connection, I should like the Assembly to remember two points. First, when this recommendation by Dayan was made, in the spring of 1955, on the initiative of President Nasser of Egypt, contacts for peace with Israel were being made through a prominent American Quaker, Mr. Elmore Jackson. These contacts took place from 12 April to 9 August 1955. The contacts did not result in peace because of Israel's fierce attack at Khan Yunis at the southern end of the Gaza Strip, which was followed a few months later by the 1956 tripartite aggression against Egypt. This episode is reported in *The New*

York Times of 28 November 1982. Secondly, where are the Israelis now in Lebanon? They are farther north than the Litani.

56. We should not be astonished either that the Zionist spokesman saw fit to attack every Arab State, régime, policy and leader in terms of human or ethnic rights, as this tactic serves the approach underlying Zionist strategic thinking and planning. The unwary may be taken in by the phenomenon of discord and disunity in the Arab world, and hence led to believe that the arguments of the Zionists are plausible. But they should not fail to reflect on the fact that the Zionist spokesman did not touch upon the direct or indirect roles of his entity in the situation. He should not fail to note how Zionist policies evolved over time with ever-increasing intensity in aggression and expansion and how Zionist spokesmen articulated their statements and declarations accordingly, including those delivered here. If any evidence is needed, none is better than the records of the General Assembly.

57. We are not going to be drawn into the Zionist trap and consequently respond to his outrageous calumnies. We fully understand the Zionist diversionary tactics which attempt to sow confusion in order to elicit a reply, only to cry out later that they are left in a helpless situation. What I shall do instead, however, is simply to point out some facts.

58. The Assembly heard the vicious attack of the Zionist spokesman against Iraq and the President of Iraq. In the first place, we should not miss the fact that the world has grown accustomed to Zionist attacks against Heads of State and Government and other leaders and statesmen. They have attacked four French Presidents in a row: President de Gaulle, President Pompidou, President Giscard d'Estaing and President Mitterrand. They have attacked Chancellor Kreisky of Austria and Chancellor Schmidt of the Federal Republic of Germany. They have attacked Lord Carrington of the United Kingdom. They have even attacked the Pope himself. It is not surprising that the Zionists should attack President Saddam Hussein, for he and Iraq have resolutely stood against Israel's aggression and *faits accomplis*. The Zionists cannot stomach steadfast resistance to their aggressive and expansionist plans.

59. The Zionist spokesman had the audacity to raise the question of the Kurds, but it is worth pointing out that Israel armed and trained Kurdish secessionist rebels from 1965 to 1975, obviously with the ominous aim of dismembering Iraq. Now, the source of this information is none other than Begin who, on 29 September 1980, as reported by *The New York Times* of that date, disclosed that "tightly suppressed secret". The report indicates that the Israeli assistance started under Eshkol and grew under Golda Meir and Rabin, and that the last Israeli instructor left when the leader of the secessionist Kurdish rebels, Barazani, was evacuated from Iraq in 1975. Should this Zionist interest in the Kurds be surprising, when the underlying basis of their strategic thinking and planning is the dissolution of the Arab States along ethnic or religious lines? It should be noted that in his statement the Zionist spokesman placed emphasis on these characteristics of the peoples of the Middle East. When the Zionist statement is perceived at face value it appears as an innocent statement of fact, but the underlying motive is different; it is to enhance the setting of the stage for the achievement of the Zionist policies of dismemberment of the Arab countries.

60. But what type of leaders does the Zionist spokesman have? Well, I have referred to Ben-Gurion's admission earlier. As for Begin, let me quote from *The Guardian*: "in a letter in May 1963, quoted in *Israel* of June 15 1977, Israel's first Prime Minister, David Ben-Gurion

said: 'Begin is a thoroughly Hitlerite type, ready to destroy all the Arabs . . . [If Begin takes over the country] he will put his thugs into the army and police headquarters, and will rule just like Hitler ruled in Germany . . . I have no doubt that Begin hates Hitler, but this hatred does not prove that he is different from him . . . When for the first time I heard Begin on the radio, I heard the voice and the screeching of Hitler.'"

This is a full, direct quote from a letter by a non-Arab, addressed to the editor of *The Guardian* and published on 30 June 1982. It is significant to note that the writer of the letter raises the question whether Ben-Gurion could be dismissed as an anti-Semite or whether Ben-Gurion was right. I am sure that the Zionist spokesman in the General Assembly would dismiss the writer of the letter as anti-Semite, despite the fact that he was quoting a former Prime Minister of Israel, for those who point out the truth are often so dismissed.

61. Well, Begin has gone. What about Shamir? In his well-documented study, *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators: A Reappraisal*,⁴ the author, Lenni Brenner, related the history of Zionism to the events of the Second World War, showing the interaction between Herzl's movement and the rise of fascism and nazism in Europe. In chapter 26 of his study, Lenni Brenner dealt with the Stern Gang as follows:

"Until Begin's election victory in 1977, most pro-Zionist historians dismissed Revisionism as the fanatic fringe of Zionism; certainly the more extreme 'Stern Gang', as their enemies called Avraham Stern's Fighters for the Freedom of Israel, were looked upon as of more interest to the psychiatrist than the political scientist. However, opinion toward Begin had to change when he came to power; and when he eventually appointed Yitzhak Shamir as his Foreign Minister, it was quietly received, although Shamir had been operations commander of the Stern Gang.

"On the night of 31 August/1 September 1939, the entire command of the Irgun, including Stern, was arrested by the British CID. When he was released, in June 1940, Stern found an entirely new political constellation. Jabotinsky had called off all military operations against the British for the duration of the war. Stern himself was willing to ally himself with the British so long as London would recognize the sovereignty of a Jewish State on both sides of the River Jordan. Until then, the anti-British struggle would have to continue. Jabotinsky knew that nothing would make Britain give the Jews a State in 1940, and he saw the creation of another Jewish Legion with the British Army to be the main task. The two orientations were incompatible and by September 1940 the Irgun was hopelessly split: the majority of both the command and the ranks followed Stern out of the Revisionist movement.

"At birth the new group was at its greatest strength for, as Stern's policies became clearer, the ranks started drifting back into the Irgun or joined the British Army. Stern or 'Yair', as he now called himself, (after Eleazer ben Yair, the commander at Masada during the revolt against Rome) began to define his full objectives. His 18 principles included a Jewish State with its borders as defined in Genesis 15:18 'from the brook of Egypt to the great river, the river Euphrates', a 'population exchange', a euphemism for the expulsion of the Arabs and, finally, the building of a Third Temple of Jerusalem. The Stern group was at this time a bare majority of the military wing of Revisionism, but by no means representative of the middle class Jews of Palestine who had backed Jabotinsky. Still less was the fanatic call for a new temple attractive to ordinary Zionists."

62. The writer goes on to say:

"Stern's single-minded belief, that the only solution to the Jewish catastrophe in Europe was the end of British domination of Palestine, had a logical conclusion. They could not defeat Britain with their own puny forces, so they looked to her enemies for salvation. They came into contact with an Italian agent in Jerusalem, a Jew who worked for the British police, and in September 1940 they drew up an agreement whereby Mussolini would recognize a Zionist state in return for Sternist co-ordination with the Italian Army when the country was to be invaded. How seriously either Stern or the Italian agent took these discussions has been debated. Stern feared that the agreement might be part of a British provocation. As a precaution, Stern sent Naftali Lubentschik to Beirut, which was still controlled by Vichy, to negotiate directly with the Axis. Nothing is known of his dealings with either Vichy or the Italians, but in January 1941 Lubentschik met two Germans, Rudolf Rosen and Otto von Hentig, the philo-Zionist, who was then head of the Oriental Department of the German Foreign Office. After the war"—and here is what is significant—"a copy of the Stern proposal for an alliance between his movement and the Third Reich was discovered in the files of the German Embassy in Turkey. The Ankara document called itself a 'Proposal of the National Military Organization [NMO] (Irgun Zeva'i Leumi) Concerning the Solution of the Jewish Question in Europe and the Participation of the NMO in the War on the side of Germany'. The Ankara document is dated 11 January 1941. At that point, the Sternists still thought of themselves as the 'real' Irgun, and it was only later that they adopted the name Fighters for the Freedom of Israel—Lohamei Herut Yisrael. In the document, the Stern group told the Nazis the following:

"The evacuation of the Jewish masses from Europe is a pre-condition for solving the Jewish question; but this can only be made possible and complete through the settlement of these masses in the home of the Jewish people, Palestine, and through the establishment of a Jewish State in its historical boundaries . . .

"The NMO, which is well-acquainted with the goodwill of the German Reich government and its authorities towards Zionist activity inside Germany and towards Zionist emigration plans, is of the opinion that:

'1. Common interests could exist between the establishment of a New Order in Europe in conformity with the German concept, and the true national aspirations of the Jewish people as they are embodied by the NMO.

'2. Co-operation between the new Germany and a renewed volkish-national Hebrum would be possible and

'3. The establishment of the historical Jewish State on a national and totalitarian basis, and bound by a treaty with the German Reich, would be in the interest of a maintained and strengthened future German position of power in the Near East.

'Proceeding from these considerations, the NMO in Palestine, under the condition the above-mentioned national aspirations of the Israeli freedom movement are recognized on the side of the German Reich, offers to actively take part in the War on Germany's side.'

"This offer by the NMO . . . would be connected to the military training and organizing of Jewish manpower in Europe, under the leadership and command

of the NMO. These military units would take part in the fight to conquer Palestine, should such a front be decided upon.

"The indirect participation of the Israeli freedom movement in the New Order in Europe, already in the preparatory stage, would be linked with a positive-radical solution of the European Jewish problem in conformity with the above-mentioned national aspirations of the Jewish people. This would extraordinarily strengthen the moral basis of the New Order in the eyes of all humanity.

"The Sternists again emphasized: 'The NMO is closely related to the totalitarian movements of Europe in its ideology and structure'."

63. The author goes on to say:

"There was no German follow-up on these incredible propositions, but the Sternists did not lose hope. In December 1941, after the British had taken Lebanon, Stern sent Nathan Yalin-Mor to try to contact the Nazis in neutral Turkey, but he was arrested en route. There were no further attempts to contact the Nazis."

64. Lenni Brenner continues:

"There is rather more substance to Stern's own self-perception as a totalitarian. By the late 1930s, Stern became one of the ring-leaders of the Revisionist malcontents who saw Jabotinsky as a liberal with moral reservations about Irgun terror against the Arabs. Stern felt that the only salvation for the Jews was to produce their own Zionist form of totalitarianism and make a clean break with Britain, which, in any case, had abandoned zionism with the 1939 White Paper. He had seen the World Zionist Organization make its own accommodation with nazism by means of the Ha'avara; he had seen Jabotinsky entangle himself with Italy; and he personally had been intimately involved in the Revisionists' dealings with the Polish anti-Semites. However, Stern believed that all of these were only half-measures.

"Stern was one of the Revisionists who felt that the Zionists, and the Jews, had betrayed Mussolini and not the reverse. Zionism had to show the Axis that they were serious, by coming into direct military conflict with Britain, so that the totalitarians could see a potential military advantage in allying themselves with zionism. To win, Stern argued, they had to ally themselves with the Fascists and Nazis alike: one could not deal with a Petliura or a Mussolini and then draw back from a Hitler."

65. Now, was Shamir, the present Prime Minister of Israel, aware of all this? Lenni Brenner has this to say:

"Did Yitzhak Yzertinsky—rabbi Shamir, to use his underground *nom de guerre*— . . . know of his movement's proposed confederation with Adolf Hitler? In recent years the wartime activities of the Stern Gang have been thoroughly researched by one of the youths who joined it in the post-war period, when it was no longer pro-Nazi. Baruch Nadel is absolutely certain that Yzertinsky-Shamir was fully aware of Stern's plan: 'They all knew about it.'"

He concludes as follows:

"When Begin appointed Shamir, and honoured Stern by having postage stamps issued which bore his portrait, he did it with the full knowledge of their past. There can be no better proof than this that the heritage of Zionist collusion with the Fascists and the Nazis, and the philosophies underlying it, carries through to contemporary Israel."

66. Lenni Brenner is not an Arab, and this account is more than sufficient to show how far the Zionists are

prepared to go for the achievement of their goals. This goes for all their groups. And when we become aware of these and other facts, it is an insult to our common sense for the Zionists to proclaim zionism as a "liberation movement", because this mendacious allegation is akin to saying that *apartheid* is a "liberation movement" as well.

67. The Zionist representative raised, among other extraneous subjects, the question of the Iraq-Iran war. The General Assembly heard the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq in October last [12th meeting]. I am sure that the Zionist representative could not possibly be unaware of the fact that Iraq has agreed to all the initiatives since 28 September 1980 calling for an end to the war, that it has invited the international community to arbitrate the issue and that it reaffirmed its invitation to the United Nations from this rostrum. In the words of my Minister for Foreign Affairs:

"The Iraqi proposal calls for the formation of a neutral arbitration committee to determine which side started the aggression and the war and which side bears the responsibility for continuing the war all this time, with all the human and material losses that it has entailed. Iraq is prepared to accept the results of such arbitration." [Ibid., para. 131.]

68. Could the Zionist representative give any examples of a similar readiness to arbitrate Zionist aggression against the Palestinian people and the Arab countries—before he sheds crocodile tears over the loss of human life and the material damage and damage to the environment?

69. It should be clear by now what the real problem in the Middle East is. The relentless Zionist policy, encouraged by the United States—now the Zionists' strategic ally—aimed at conquering the whole of Palestine; the denial of the right of the Palestinians to existence, self-determination and nationhood in their national home; and the continued policy of aggression, occupation and annexation of Arab territories: all this cannot be dismissed as "barren rhetoric" or "pseudo-issues", as the Zionist spokesman claimed. This policy is the root cause of the Arab-Israeli conflict, which remains the core of the item entitled "The situation in the Middle East", now before the General Assembly.

70. Mr. MRANI ZENTAR (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): When at the thirty-seventh session the General Assembly considered the problem of the Middle East, just as it is considering it today, the world was still reeling from the horror of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, the constant bombardments of Beirut and the proliferation of odious massacres of innocent civilians, without discrimination as to sex or age. We thought and said at the time that we had finally seen the worst, and that the situation, which had been building up for months, could only improve, since Israel had apparently carried out most of its diabolical plans against the exiled Palestinians and brother Lebanon. But that was far from being the case.

71. The tension created by Israel since 1948 between it and the Palestinian people and the neighbouring Arab countries, a tension manifested initially in a cycle of successive wars of aggression, has become a chronic running sore which has inflamed almost the whole of Lebanese national territory and led to the commitment in the area of many foreign forces, recognized or unrecognized.

72. The inexorable escalation of violence that has followed has assumed a new dimension and is becoming more and more beyond the control dictated by reason. International peace and security are every day in more

danger because of the tragic situation thus created. All international efforts to bring peace to the Middle East have since then focused on one incident or another in Lebanon, which in turn quickly provokes another incident which is bigger and more difficult to resolve.

73. This situation, fraught with booby traps and time bombs planted throughout Lebanese territory, is clearly taking up most of the time of foreign ministries and international conferences.

74. But what is happening today about the problems that are really at the heart of the crisis? What is happening about Gaza and the West Bank? We know that the dispossession and deportation of the Arab inhabitants is continuing apace, as is the Judaization of those territories, that the number of Israeli militarized settlements has almost doubled since then and that the primary strategic target of 100,000 armed settlers would appear to have been reached already.

75. The defacement of Arab Jerusalem is still going on, and the Islamic Holy Places are still under occupation and threatened with destruction by desecrators, arsonists and over-eager archaeologists. The Holy City of Al-Quds, symbol and living proof of the depth and splendor of the Islamic faith, has been annexed, in defiance of international decisions, and improperly named the "eternal capital of Israel".

Mr. Karran (Guyana), Vice-President, took the Chair.

76. The Syrian Golan Heights, an integral part of the national territory of the Syrian Arab Republic, has suffered a similar fate, in spite of all the international decisions strictly forbidding the acquisition of territory by force.

77. Threats of aggression and acts of aggression such as the unjustifiable attack on the Tammuz peaceful nuclear installations in Iraq may be repeated and extended, according to Israeli leaders themselves, to civilian targets when Israel thinks fit, in spite of all the international condemnations and expressions of disapproval.

78. Finally, Lebanon, which has seen its internal stability and security shattered since the Israeli invader entered the country, is struggling today with all its remaining energy to preserve its territorial integrity and national sovereignty and to emerge from the chaos brought about by the Israeli invasion.

79. We assure the brother people of Lebanon of our whole-hearted solidarity with it and our support in its efforts to achieve and defend its goals of national unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity in regained peace and tranquillity.

80. This extension of the Middle East crisis to Lebanon is neither a surprise nor a mystery to those who are aware of the Zionist plans, inspired by Ben-Gurion as long ago as 1948, and improved and followed in cynical detail by Moshe Dayan. Those plans aim at nothing less than the complete disorganization of Lebanon, regarded as the weakest link, followed by its use as a springboard for various destabilizing actions against the neighbouring Arab States, and even against more distant Arab countries, in order the more easily to secure additional openly coveted scraps and thus to reconstitute what is called Greater Israel, a land which no Israeli leader can today clearly define or draw precise borders for.

81. The whole international community has therefore allowed itself to be diverted by what has become the Lebanese affair, an affair which is worsening all the time because of a series of mini-plots which the Israeli invasion opened the way to and fuelled. That is why His Majesty King Hassan II told the General Assembly with great foresightedness a few weeks ago that we had thought that

“by solving the problem of one country, an extremely complex problem . . . we would solve the general problem. We walked blindly into the trap set by the common enemy. We naïvely believed that we could solve the general Arab problem by solving that of Lebanon. Thus . . . we sat blocked behind that small tree instead of reaching the goal. That is why . . . we lost perspective”. [8th meeting, para. 10.]

82. This bitter realization is the sign of a profound awareness of the true roots of the evil which has been gnawing away at the Middle East for almost four decades. It is also an urgent appeal, first to all the countries concerned, and then to all the members of the international community, to close their ranks, mobilize their material and moral forces and redouble their vigilance in order to restore to the region law, justice, freedom and peaceful co-operation between all the peoples.

83. It has been internationally recognized that just and lasting peace and harmony of that kind can be established only on the basis of the evacuation of all the occupied Arab territories, including the Holy City of Jerusalem, and the effective exercise by the Arab people of Palestine, under the leadership of its legitimate representative, the PLO, of its inalienable right to return to its territory and establish its own independent, sovereign State in Palestine, in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions.

84. Only a year ago, at the Twelfth Arab Summit Conference, held at Fez, the Arab leaders drew up unanimously and presented to the world, on 9 September 1982, a realistic, bold and responsible plan, known as the Arab peace plan,¹ which in a certain sense echoed the Reagan plan,² which was considered inadequate on the question of Palestine, but was regarded as capable of improvement. The Arab peace plan, which remains valid as a basis for a genuine peace, is based on the following cardinal principles: Israeli withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem; the dismantling of settlements; the reaffirmation of the inalienable right of the people of Palestine to return to its country and to establish its own independent State; and a Security Council guarantee of peace for all the States of the region.

85. In that perspective, the Arab action was actively supported by the Organization of the Islamic Conference and a number of international initiatives were undertaken to that end by its Al-Quds Committee, presided over by His Majesty King Hassan II, with regard both to States which have a role to play in this context and to international organizations and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

86. We call on the United Nations and all countries which love peace and justice to combine their efforts to bring about a just and equitable peace in the Middle East, and urge them to give their sincere support to the Arab peoples of the region, in particular to the Palestinian people who are fighting for a just cause. At the same time, we also call upon States which are co-operating closely with Israel to refrain from offering it any political or military assistance—which in the circumstances is totally unjustified and, moreover, cannot possibly serve the interests of peace.

87. In this context, I should like to express my satisfaction at the personal efforts of the Secretary-General towards peace and the easing of human suffering; I should like also to pay a tribute to his wisdom and clear-sightedness, reflected in particular in his report to the General Assembly [A/38/458].

88. Mr. WEEDY (Afghanistan): The situation in the Middle East continues to be a source of great concern to

the peace-loving peoples of the world. With the passing of time, the situation has deteriorated further owing to the aggressive policies of the Zionist régime of Israel. This deterioration has far-reaching repercussions for world peace and security. The efforts of the international community to reach a just and lasting solution to the problem are continually hampered by the aggressive policies of Israel and by United States imperialism.

89. The core of the problem of the Middle East, rightly recognized by the majority of peace-loving humanity, is the question of Palestine. As long as Israel continues to occupy their lands and the Palestinian people are denied their rights to self-determination and to establish their independent State in Palestine, peace will be a lost cause in the Middle East.

90. Israel, in complete disregard of all norms of international law, continues to occupy the territories of the Palestinian people and has embarked on wide-scale efforts to change the demographic character of the occupied territories by establishing an ever-increasing number of Jewish settlements and forcing the indigenous Arab and Palestinian population out of their homeland. Israel's policies are aimed at the final annexation of those territories.

91. The annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights and the Holy City of Jerusalem has been achieved with total impunity, despite the opposition of the people and States of the region and of the international community. Israel's aggressive policies and ambitions for the creation of the so-called Greater Israel have endangered the security and territorial integrity of the countries of the region.

92. Israel intends to solve the problem of the Middle East in its own way—by eradicating the Palestinian people and its sole legitimate representative, the PLO. Israel's bellicose designs are by now very familiar to the international community. The events in Lebanon last year are clear proof of these sinister intentions which Israel has openly proclaimed. Israel invaded Lebanon in order physically to liquidate the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. The indiscriminate shelling of Beirut from land, sea and air with phosphorus and cluster bombs, even during the intervals when cease-fires were imposed, is a clear indication of Israel's criminal intention completely to annihilate the Palestinian people. The events of last year in Lebanon culminated with the massacre at Sabra and Shatila, which will not be erased from the memories of the peoples of the world.

93. Israel would not have been able to pursue its aggressive policies without the unconditional moral and material support of United States imperialism. The United States has supported the aggressive policies of Israel all along, with total disregard for the demands of the international community, which has made every effort to bring about a just and lasting peace in the Middle East and to put an end to the aggression of Israel against the Palestinian people and the Arab countries of the region.

94. The aggressive policies of Israel are designed not only to expand its territories and consolidate its grip on Palestinian and other Arab lands but also to pave the way for the creeping presence of United States imperialism in that sensitive region which the United States claims as an area of its vital interest. Today, United States imperialism, with the pretense of peace-keeping, has further complicated the situation.

95. In the past, United States imperialism used Israel to destabilize progressive governments and oppose national liberation movements in the region, but today the United States, together with Israel, is directly involved. By its unprecedented presence in the Middle East, the United

States has taken the people of the region hostage to its strategic claims. It has converted the whole area into a bridgehead against progressive régimes and national liberation movements.

96. The latest strategic agreements between Tel Aviv and Washington, which were reached during the visit of the Prime Minister of the Zionist entity in November this year and the co-ordination of their aggressive designs against the Palestinian people are but further examples of the long list of the crimes of imperialism against the people of the Middle East. The presence of over 35 United States battleships in the coastal waters of Lebanon, the continuous shelling of the positions of Lebanese patriotic forces and the brazen attacks against Syrian positions show that the United States and its ally, Israel, have something more sinister up their sleeves.

97. The recent agreements between the United States and Israel have caused great apprehension in the international community. Those agreements have enabled Israel to achieve further means of destruction, among them phosphorous and cluster bombs—bombs which last year spread havoc and destruction among the civilian population of Beirut and other Lebanese cities. The newest developments in the relations of Israel and the United States have exacerbated further the already volatile situation and have endangered the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Arab countries of the region and are another threat to the Palestinian people.

98. It seems that the diaspora of the Palestinian people has no end. The threats to their very survival take on newer dimensions as time passes. But, to the astonishment of its enemies, the Palestinians continue their struggle with ever greater vigour and heroism, despite the unfavourable odds. They have truly and rightly earned the respect and sympathy of peace-loving humanity.

99. The people of Palestine and their vanguard, the PLO, have our complete support in their just struggle. We would like to urge them to safeguard their unity against their common enemies, the Israeli Zionists and United States imperialism.

100. The extremely dangerous situation which is created in the Middle East makes an early reaching of an agreement ever more imperative. This agreement should involve all the parties concerned in the problem. Experience has shown that separate deals have only helped the enemies

of the Palestinian people, who have been given a free hand in the pursuance of their aggressive policies.

101. The first step in the settlement of the problem of the Middle East is the unconditional withdrawal of Israel from the territories it has occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem. This should be followed by the realization by the Palestinian people of their inalienable rights to self-determination and to the establishment of their independent State in Palestinian lands.

102. The PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, is the indivisible part of any just and lasting peace process. It should be able to participate in any peace efforts on an equal footing with other parties concerned.

103. The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan supports the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, under the auspices of the United Nations and with the participation of concerned parties, including the Soviet Union, the United States and the PLO, on an equal footing, to come to the earliest possible decision on the basis of the Charter of the United Nations and relevant United Nations resolutions.

104. We strongly support the valiant people of Palestine under the leadership of the PLO. We have full confidence that they will ultimately succeed in the struggle for the realization of their national aspirations. It is then that peace can be possible in the Middle East.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

NOTES

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-seventh Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1982*, document S/15510.

² See *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*, Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1982, vol. 18, No. 35, p. 1081.

³ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973, p. 287.

⁴ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Thirty-fifth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1980*, document S/14002.

⁵ See *Report of the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, Geneva, 29 August-7 September 1983* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.83.I.21), chap. I.

⁶ London and Canberra, Groom Helm, 1983.